

THE LIBERATOR.
PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY
AT THE ANTI-SLAVERY OFFICE, 21, CORNHILL.
ROBERT F. WALLACE, GENERAL AGENT.
All remittances are to be made, and all letters relating to the pecuniary concerns of the paper are to be directed (post paid), to the General Agent.
TERMS.—\$2 00 per annum, payable in advance; or \$2 50 at the expiration of six months.
Six copies will be sent to an address for ten dollars, if payment be forwarded in advance.
Advertisements making less than one square, inserted three times for 75 cts., one square for \$1 00.
Financial Committee.—FRANCIS JACKSON, ELIAS GAY LORING, EDWARD QUINCY, SAMUEL PHILLIPS, WELLES PHILLIPS. [This committee is responsible only for the financial economy of the paper.]
WM. LLOYD GARRISON, EDITOR.

VOL. XVII.—NO. 28.
REFUGE OF OPPRESSION

From the Northampton Democrat.
WHITE SLAVERY.

Serious—black and white.—The poor negro must work for others, or be starved. The poor white man, if he is not a slave, is a pauper. The poor white man is a slave only as long as he is able to toil, and a pauper when he can no longer do so. —E. P.

It seems to me that there is a great deal of truth in the above paragraph. We cannot see why a poor white man is not as properly a slave as a poor black man. What is a slave? We understand a slave to be one who is compelled to labor for another. To oblige one man to labor for the benefit of another.

Any person who has no property or capital, must sell himself, or at least his services, for whatever he can get, or starve. He is entirely dependant on his neighbors for permission to procure subsistence. He is not allowed to cultivate any share of that soil which Nature has freely given to all men, and consequently must live on such terms as others will consent to. Is the black man more helpless and dependant being? Is there a greater advantage taken of the condition of the black slave than of the white? and is the black slave in a more pitiable condition than the white one?

The black slave is compelled to toil for the benefit of others. The white slave is also compelled to toil for the benefit of others, and according to the abolitionists themselves, the labor of the white slave is 25 per cent. more profitable to the employer than that of the black, which is saying that the white slave works for less than the black, thus the black slave is the more profitable. The family of the white slave are often compelled to separate, and the children are frequently sent into the factories and cities where their health and morals are too generally seriously injured or totally ruined. The black slave cannot choose his own master. Very frequently it is with the white slave. He is often sold that he can never be separated from him. The black slave is sometimes compelled to submit to the floggings of his masters. So it is in regard to our own white slaves and daughters. In large cities, many of them are unable to earn a bare subsistence, except by criminal means. Among the thousands of abandoned souls in New York, and in every city, to believe there are great numbers who would gladly live a virtuous, honorable and respected life, if they could find employment at good wages, and few indeed would ever have been irreversibly ruined and given themselves up to an abandoned life had they always been enabled to reside in a comfortable home with their parents.

The white slave cannot vote. Neither can a white woman; a white man can, indeed, but if he has this free allowance which, however, he has not in Rhode Island—and if, in most cases is the case, the white slave is allowed a common school education, the black slave is free from the care, responsibility and expense of educating his own children. The negro slave is not at the trouble to provide food, clothing, education, employment, etc. for himself and family, nor does he fear that either he or they will be compelled to go to the almshouse from want of employment, or in consequence of old age, sickness or misfortune.

How far these two degrees of inequality, the two systems of wages and chattel slavery, but look at another fact. The penalty for disobedience, laziness or idleness, in the one case, is the whip; in the other, hunger, lack of clothing, etc. The black slave is seldom whipped to death or murdered, while at the very time, WHITE SLAVES ARE BEING STARVED TO DEATH BY MILLIONS! A tremendous hue and cry would be raised, if only a few thousand negro slaves should be murdered, but even instantaneously! Would not a radical remedy for slavery be insisted on? And yet the British government is starving their white slaves to death by millions, while at the same time, they are sending their colored slaves to the West Indies, and the very Christian Queen, her household and nobility are feeding their hounds and stags about as liberally, and allowing as large a share of the fertile soil for their use, as ever.

We say the British government is starving their slaves. It is the result of their laws. No being can live without food, and no one can live on the soil. Hence, any government, our own not excepted, which denies its citizens their right to the soil, denies their right to live. Hence the poor can only live by the consent and on the terms dictated by the rich. And the masses of this country are being gradually reduced to the same condition as the masses of Europe and Asia. The time a radical remedy for slavery is now in operation? Workingmen! ye who receive only one half or fourth part of what you produce, remember that 'they who would be free themselves, must strike the blow.' They who riot on the fruit of your industry will be slow to strike for you to encourage you to strike for yourselves. Yet union and energy would soon give you equal rights—equal wages, the right to labor for yourselves, and for your own benefit.

From the Richmond (Virginia) Whig.
DANIEL WEBSTER.
Scarcely had Mr. Webster commenced his Southern tour, when the rabid abolitionists, with Wendell Phillips and Garrison at their head, opened their batteries upon him; and as he progressed, they threw their stones, and hurled their slanders, and the Boston Whig and Courier, affect to be rather respectful to herd with the Garrisonians, although they differ from them only in the want of frankness to avow their nefarious designs, or in the cunning which hopes the more certainly to accomplish their ends, by wearing the Whig livery, have begun to give indications of discontent and disaffection. True, they do not yet openly denounce Mr. Webster. A course so candid would not be characteristic. But they are 'showing their teeth,' and doubling their efforts, by throwing their Whig masks, they will fasten their fangs upon the great man, whose opinions, fairly avowed, are so stinging a rebuke to their hypocritical and fanatical course. The Whig party in Massachusetts, we regret to say, has already made too many and too great concessions to this mischievous faction in its bosom, by nursing its growth, and by its own conduct, and by its own inaction, which may succeed in perpetuating their power in that Commonwealth, but must inevitably be shattered from the Whig party of the South, and from that conservative portion of their brethren in the Northern States, who, under the lead of Mr. Webster, however adverse to the institution of slavery, and however opposed to the North, as it manifests the entire body of public sentiment in the North, are nevertheless resolved to adhere firmly to the Constitution and its compromise, and to repel all interference with an institution which, however odious in their eyes, is recognized and guaranteed by the compact into which their fathers voluntarily entered with ours.

How vain the attempt to propitiate the southern members by a milk-and-water course!



OUR COUNTRY IS THE WORLD—OUR COUNTRYMEN ARE ALL MANKIND
BOSTON, FRIDAY, JULY 9, 1847.

THE LIBERATOR.

APPEAL TO THE POCKET.
LONDON, May, 1847.

DEAR GARRISON:
Though society is going onwards and upwards, and its motives to action are daily increasing, deepening and purifying, yet I have always my hopes of realizing an end greatly strengthened, when I can see the breches' pocket argument is truly brought to its aid. Bring the increase or probable increase of dollars into the scale, and the beam will incline to the seller. I read with the greatest pleasure, therefore, the following paragraph in a recent Anti-Slavery Standard.

ANTI-SLAVERY IN DELAWARE.—There is said to be a strong anti-slavery feeling awakening in Delaware. Petitions are in circulation, praying the Legislature to abolish slavery, and though there is little hope that they will be immediately granted, the mere fact that such petitions are offered in a slaveholding State is a cheering sign. The movement once begun, and it cannot go backward. A Wilmington paper, referring to this question, says:

'We have heretofore said, that no other measure would conduce so much to the prosperity of little Delaware. A tide of emigration would set in here by buying up and improving our old worn out lands, and the million acres supposed to be contained in Delaware would be worth more than five millions of dollars more as soon as such a law is passed. Our interests require it. There are only about two thousand slaves in Delaware.'

God speed the day of their emancipation!

This breches' pocket argument, which the cause of West India abolition had considerably advanced in England, and men had been driven to reason upon it, became a very powerful persuasive to the West India Proprietors. They were most of them in a state of insolvency, receiving only just the small balances which were left after the mortgages and consignees were paid; and the notion of increasing the returns was a very rational object in their view. That motive had induced them to prefer those drivers and managers, who could realize greater remittances than others; and if they could get more by the proposed than by the then existing mode, they had no objection to discuss it. At last, that argument went through its paces, and left them less bitter; enquiring, 'How much will you give us?' And that led to the £20,000,000. It was not with them, that they loved the whip for the sake of the cruelty; that is the failing of a few bad-bred tempered wretches, who are badly organized, and born in and surrounded by its deteriorating influences, and badly educated besides. It is, that the maintenance of their own position, which is a necessity to the planters, and compels them, or they think it compels them, which is the same thing as it regards the result, to do as their fathers have done before them, and shut up their senses in forgetfulness of those higher principles which must be set down for them, and because their fathers and mothers professed them, and taught them from their infancy upwards.

Only satisfy the proprietors of land in Delaware and in Virginia, that free labor would increase the value of their land, and you would add marvellously to their love of liberty. Show them that it is profitable, and they will be greatly inclined to think that it is Christian; an increase of dollars will go a great way to increase their charity. The antipathy between the races may then be assailed as the next step in advance; but while the white has despotic power, the antipathy cannot be overcome. We must abolish the practice, before we can effectually deal with the sentiment. It is sheer absurdity to talk about the natural antipathy to intercourse, when we see the results of intercourse constantly before our eyes.

Our religious, moral and social world, here, is much excited just now upon the educational question. Our whig government, under the influence of our State Clergy, are proposing to take funds from the taxes to breed school-masters, to teach the State Catechism, and the duty of submitting to the powers that be, and the right divine of kings to govern wrong; or, as we would say, when applying it to the English government, say, the right divine of the aristocracy to govern wrong in the name of the Sovereign; for since the 'glorious' Revolution in 1688, our aristocracy love to call it glorious—they have managed to strip the Crown of all the Crown lands, to divide them among themselves, and make the Sovereign, for the time being, a public and avowed pensioner upon the people.

The expenses of the Sovereign are paid out of the State purse, and the direct and indirect expenses do not take much less than a million of money out of the taxes raised from a people, seven millions of whom have been so reduced by the stewardship of this same aristocracy, that they have been designated as a nation, 'the starving Irish.'

The papers of the present week contain acknowledgements by the official chief of that country, the subscription for your country to alleviate the starving state of that people. The aristocracy have had, and still have, the land, the source, with labor, of all wealth, and the law-making in their own hands. And this is the result of what really and truly is absolute power over the destiny of a country, let it be vested in whose hands it may. What should we say of the father of a family, who with abundance of income, so managed that income as to starve more than half of his children, and reduce the whole to the fear of starvation?

Let us put the case lower—for it will not do to judge the aristocracy by a high moral standard. What should we say of the governor of a small island, who, having abundance of land and of labor, and the power to make laws to secure its distribution for the common good—such an abundance that, from its produce, an increase of the gross income took place yearly—and yet such was his management in the distribution, that more than half of his prisoners suffered the pangs of starvation through the year, and many died of absolute want; whilst others enjoyed to repletion and waste, and the produce was sent from the island for sale during the starvation? Would not such a governor be removed? I know that even our own aristocracy, tender as they are to their cousins whom they send out as governors, would cashier such a governor. The day will come when governors and nations will understand that political economy consists not only in the production of wealth, but in arrangements for its just distribution, so that all may participate, and all may be comforted.

EDWARD SEARCH.
We would renew the expression of our grateful acknowledgments to our attractive and sagacious London correspondent, for the frequency, regularity and instructive character of his letters.—B. G.

THE QUESTION OF LABOR.

One of the best speeches we heard in Boston, during the Anniversary week, was made by WENDELL PHILLIPS before the Anti-Slavery Society, against proposition to abstain from the products of slave labor. He declared that, in his opinion, the great question of Labor, when it shall fully come up, will be found paramount to all others, and that the rights of the peasants of Ireland, the operatives of New England, and the laborers of South America, will not be lost sight of in sympathy for the Southern slave. Mr. Phillips is on the high road to the principles of integral social reform. May he and all other philanthropists be brought to perceive that Slavery, War, Poverty and Oppression, are inseparable from the system of Civilization—the system of antagonistic interests—that the only effectual remedy is the introduction of a higher system—the system of union of interests and union of industry.

The notice which has been taken of the above paragraph from the HARRINGTON, leads me to correct the erroneous impression it conveys. I do not recollect making any such assertion as that above stated. The resolution under discussion, at the time referred to, spoke of the 'unrequited products' of the coerced toil of the slave. In commenting upon this expression, I said, that if it was our duty to abstain from all the products of unrequited labor, the principle would apply to many cases beside that of the slave and shut out from the use of many articles in the market, indeed most of the manufactured ones. I instance the coal mines of England—the mines of other countries—and the manufacturers of cotton, woolen, linen and silk. From the remarks of the HARRINGTON, some may suppose that I placed the Laborer of the North and the Slave on the same level, and talked perhaps of 'white slavery,' &c. I did no such thing—I dissent entirely from those doctrines. Except in a few crowded cities and a few manufacturing towns, I believe the terms 'white slavery' and 'white-slavery' would be utterly unintelligible to a audience of laboring people, as applied to themselves. There are two prominent points which distinguish the laborers in this country from the slaves. First, the laborers, as a class, are neither wronged nor oppressed; and secondly, if they were, they possess ample power to defend themselves, by the exercise of their own acknowledged rights. Does legislation bear hard upon them?—their votes can alter it. Does capital wrong them?—economy will make them capitalists. Does the crowded competition of cities reduce their wages?—they have only to stay at home, devoted to other pursuits, and soon diminished supply will bring the remedy. In the old world, absurd and unjust institutions injure all classes, and, of course, oppress first and most cruelly that class, the weakest, whose only wealth is its labor. Here, from the same cause, the imperfections which still cling to our social and political arrangements bear hardest on the laborer.

A wiser use of the public lands, a better system of taxation, disuse of war and of costly military preparation, more than all, the recognition of the rights of woman, about which we hear next to nothing from these self-styled friends of labor, will help all classes much. But to economy, self-denial, temperance, education, and moral and religious character, the laboring class, and every other class in this country, must owe its elevation and improvement. Without these, political and social changes are vain and futile. With them, all, except the equality of woman, sink into comparative insignificance. Many of the errors on this point seem to me to proceed from looking at American questions through European spectacles, and transplanting the eloquent complaints against capital and monopoly, which are well-grounded and well applied there, to a state of society here, where they have little meaning or application, and serve only for party watch-words. W. F.

OUR PLEDGE.
BOSTON, June 28, 1847.

MY DEAR GARRISON:
If the report of the Abington meeting, which I enclose, be correct, our friend Charles L. Remond seems to have taken insurrectionary ground for the slaves. I do not know whether he is an officer, but he certainly is a prominent member, and virtually to the community a representative of our Society. Our Constitution pledges us 'never to countenance a resort to physical force' on the part of the slaves. If such physical doctrines as those here attributed to Mr. Remond are stated in public by our leading men, without any signs of disapproval, do we not 'countenance' them? It seems to me one of those cases, in which silence gives consent. So, at least, the public will and I think reasonably—construct it. Mr. Remond would probably say, that he spoke only his individual sentiments. I certainly would not trammel him. But I think the Society will as naturally and reasonably be held responsible for the declarations of its leading members, if not publicly discredited from, as are the Colonization Society and the political parties.

I quite agree with Dr. Channing, that our pledge to a pacific policy was a measure of the highest expediency, and was due from us to the community, in commencing our agitation for reform. Be this, however, as it may, it is a fundamental article in all our anti-slavery constitutions; and, until it is expunged, we should live up to it, in the letter and spirit. I would not censure Mr. Remond, but I would kindly and calmly make our own position clear, by disavowing these views. I have no doubt that (like the doctrines of Young Ireland) they are destined to gain a certain currency. If so, it is the more important that we should early repeat our old pledge, that our only arms shall be those of love.

With the sincerest respect and affection,
Yours,
ELLIS GRAY LORING.

REMARK. In the report of the Abington meeting in the Whig, alluded to by our respected friend Loring, the writer says:—C. L. Remond took the ground, that the slaves were bound, by their love of justice, to rise at once, en masse, and throw off their fetters; and he, for one, would countenance such a course. He cited our revolutionary fathers as an example, whose oppression by the British government was not of a father's weight, compared with that of the slaves in the Southern States. He was aware that he should be denounced as a traitor for such sentiments, but he thought it ill became those who gloried in the principles of the revolution to condemn him for such a course. To language like this, exception may be fairly taken—not by the American people, certainly, who glory in the sanguinary deeds of revolutionary sires, fighting in defence of their rights—but by those, who, as members of the American Anti-Slavery Society, have pledged themselves to pacific words and deeds in seeking the deliverance of the wretched slaves in our land. It is possible that Mr. Remond may have been misunderstood, and that he merely made a 'patriotic' retort.

THE PRESS FOR DOUGLASS.
BOSTON, June 26th, 1847.

MR. EDITOR:—It appears from an article in the Liberator of June 25, that the project to establish an anti-slavery journal for Frederick Douglass is to be abandoned. Now, Sir, I can see no good reason for such an unexpected movement. On the contrary, much might be offered to show the necessity of carrying out the proposed arrangement. It is the opinion of very many of the 'friends of Mr. Douglass,' that he would be a successful an editor, as he has been a lecturer; and they are sustained in their opinion by the evidence of his writings, in many instances.

Those who fear that Mr. Douglass' editorial duties would withdraw him from the field as a lecturer, would do well to remember, that the editor of the Liberator devotes much time to lecturing in different parts of the country, and his editorials are none the less prompt, spirited, and plentiful. The same might be said of nearly all of the anti-slavery editors in the country.

I do not see how a reasonable doubt can be entertained as to the support of Mr. Douglass' paper. For him to intimate the possibility of its failure, for want of patronage, would be the signal for European friends to send him a subscription list as would nearly, of itself, support the paper.

Many, very many individuals in this country, who do not at present subscribe to any abolition paper, would be willing to satisfy themselves of the ability of a colored man to sustain the duties of an editor in a proper manner, by taking his paper. And many who have never had, and perhaps never will have, an opportunity to hear Douglass, would be gratified in possessing the products of his pen. And there are hundreds—I might say thousands—of colored friends, who would joyfully give him their support, in preference to any other individual, because he is better known to them than any other. Indeed, they expect the paper, and the suppression of it will be to them a severe disappointment; and it is already looked upon, by some, as an act proceeding from motives of selfishness, and one in which Mr. Douglass' inclinations have been less consulted than those of some of the leading abolitionists.

It is to be hoped that the friends of Mr. Douglass will not be hasty in deciding this matter, and that they will fully consider the step they are taking.

Yours for the right,
LIBERTAS.

FREDERICK DOUGLASS.
We are sorry to see that the talented man has been persuaded to relinquish his plan of publishing a paper. The argument used with him we presume to be that it would injure the circulation of two anti-slavery papers conducted by white men. If so, this cannot be set down to prove the inferiority of the colored race. It is pretended that the ability to put himself in the front rank of the editorial corps, and that, by all odds, is the best fulcrum for his powers. The loss of his eloquence before popular assemblies, is nothing to the gain of power he would experience by having at his own command, controlled by no party, sect or society, a printing press. We are surprised at the narrowness of mind that counselled him otherwise. The only doubt about the qualification of Mr. Douglass for an editor would be on the score of his independence, but taking the whole course of his life into consideration, we think he has a good share of that quality, and an editorial position would increase it.—Chronotype.

From the Boston Daily Whig.

MR. EDITOR:—In the 'Boston Whig' of Saturday, 26th inst, I find the following:—

'The Liberator states that Frederick Douglass has given up the project of publishing a paper in this country, and explains as a reason of his withdrawal, the impression prevailing that no paper of the kind was published by a colored man. The Liberator enumerates four papers of the kind. It might properly be asked, how came the English people to get such an impression?'

I now beg to give you the information indirectly asked for in the last sentence of the above paragraph. A few months previously to my leaving England for the United States, I was informed that it was the intention of my friends to make me a present of a sum of money, which would yield an annual income sufficient for my support. The object of my friends was to place me in circumstances which would enable me to devote myself unreservedly to the cause of the slave, and to the special obligations to supply the slaves of our country with the Bible, according to their respective opportunities and abilities.

That all laws which forbid the distribution of the Bible among the slaves of the several States, or the acquisition of the ability of the slaves to read the Bible, directly contrary to the law of God, and therefore morally null and void.

That we are gratified to learn that contributions have been transmitted to the American Bible Society for the express purpose of enabling it to supply the slaves with the Bible, which are to be called 'the slaves' fund.'

That we recommend to all our churches to aid this noble enterprise, by special donations to this object, and urge the American Bible Society to prosecute such supply with speed and vigor.

These resolutions were advocated by Rev. G. W. Perkins, in a speech of much animation and force. We were sending the Bible by millions to the heathen abroad. Why not send it to the heathen at home? They deeply need it. In many cases, masters desire them to have it. Human laws that forbid it, are we bound to regard as null and void.

Rev. T. D. P. Stone agreed to most of the views of Mr. P. The Bible should be given to every slave; for every one has rights, a conscience, an immortal soul. Politicians, even, were ready for it. The warmest advocates of slavery insist that the Bible supports their system. Let us give them as much of its support as possible.

Dr. Robbins and Mr. Parnes were for speaking in kindness, and thought some of the resolutions wanting in this spirit.

Dr. Hewitt, in reply to the inquiry whether slaveholders do not utterly disregard all laws against teaching slaves, said that so far as he knew, slaveholders themselves said that such laws were not

THE CATHOLIC CLERGY—THE FAMINE.

The Anti-Slavery Standard, of last week, contains an interesting letter from RICHARD D. WEBB of Dublin, of which the following is an extract:—

In the part of the country to which my attention was more particularly directed, there was scarcely a sufficiency of individuals beyond the reach of absolute want, to dispense the relief that was sent for the sufferers. The last included one resident landlord, two Episcopal clergymen, a few middlemen (or holders of land liable to rent, who had poor tenants under them,) and the revenue and coast guard officers of the district, with the men under their command. Of the Roman clergy, with very few exceptions, I heard a middling account. They were generally accused of distributing the funds or provisions entrusted to them, to those who had paid themselves best, or who, if matters should take a turn for the better, would be likely to be the most profitable sheep in their flocks. Of the licentiousness, rapacity, dishonesty, and selfishness of some of them, I heard shocking accounts, sometimes from their own people, who complained bitterly of their neglect and hard-heartedness. One was the wife of the man I saw dying, while his naked child sat in the ashes, and the dead body of a woman lay under a covering at the opposite side of the fire-place. I omitted to mention that an old woman sat in the middle of the hut, with an infant on her lap, three weeks old. The mother of the baby had died shortly after the infant's birth. She was the wife of the man I saw dying. The old woman had merely stepped in to look after the poor infant. Well, it was on a Sunday I saw this sight, and I was accompanied to the place by some poor people from the chapel, where I had been talking to them about the state of the country. They assured me that their priest had refused to anoint the dying man, to change his wife after her confinement, or to baptize the new-born infant, unless he were first paid two shillings! I believe that it would have been difficult to get two shillings for all that was in the cabin when I visited it. I heard other reports extremely discreditable to this priest's character for common honesty, but this refusal of some of the most important of the rites of his Church to the poor creatures, I thought a plain proof of shocking heartlessness, or of absolute infidelity in the efficacy of his own ministrations. The concurrent testimony of that country is to the effect, that the hold of the Roman Catholic clergy upon the confidence and affection of the people is much on the decline since the famine, and numbers who have been kindly looked after by Episcopal ministers have declared their willingness to renounce the Church of Rome, and attend the worship of the Established Church. Such offers were generally declined for the present, with the condition that they will be very welcome to make the change whenever they are more of free agents.

On another subject of considerable interest, our philanthropic friend says:—

I am glad that Garrison has so candidly declared his opinion about the reception of the slaves in the bounty. I like to see this openness and independence among Abolitionists—that each man can be himself; that they can agree to differ, one from another, and yet can co-operate for the one great end. It is well that he holds to his own opinion on the purchase of Douglass, and the use of slave-grown produce; and that other honest men give the same opinion in principle and spirit. He did not see that such resolutions were specially called for; and objected to calling on the churches for additional contributions, when so many objects were already before them, and to going out of our way to urge the Bible Society to a work to which they would be prompt enough, if it promised good.

Rev. Mr. Hyde thought we over-estimated the effect of passing resolutions on this or any subject. Every good work begins in heaven, and Providence opens the way for it on earth.

Mr. Buman, himself a young man of color, and pastor of a colored church in Hartford, remarked that the original resolutions had passed in the Association unanimously, in simple and plain language they explicated? The Garrisonian Abolitionists denounced the movement of sending Bibles to the slaves. Much had been said of speaking to slaveholders kindly; he thought the voice of kindness and mercy should be spoken also to the slave.

Mr. Dutton spoke of schools having been closed at the South, against the wishes of pious persons; and he wished to have the resolution pass, in order to strengthen the hands of such.

Dr. Davidson, delegate from the Old School General Assembly, would not have spoken a word, were it not for the same reason. He had been borne in mind, that the South and South West had been set led very differently from Connecticut. The state of things was in consequence widely diverse. Religion had never been there the law of the land. The wealth and influence were not in the hands of the church. Laws were passed not in accordance with the conscience of the people, and in point of fact, as had been observed by Dr. Hewitt and others, the law was continually evaded, and instruction given. There was no canon of the General Assembly forbidding the instruction of slaves, or disciplining any person who chose to teach them. As to the effect of agitation, it was the prevailing sentiment among pious persons in the slave States, that the more they were agitated, and only tightened the bonds, and done harm. Of this instances were given. It was this that had closed the schools, and procured the passage of stringent laws. The best plan was to leave this matter in the hands of the church, and it would be forwarded as rapidly and as safely as in any other way.

Further remarks and discussion, the 3rd and 5th resolutions were taken up, and all amended, so as to read as follows, in which form they were passed:

1. Resolved, That every human being has a right to the Holy Scriptures, and a right to acquire the learning necessary to peruse them.

2. That the people of the United States are under special obligations to supply the slaves of our country with the Bible, according to their respective opportunities and abilities.

3. That we are gratified to learn that contributions have been transmitted to the American Bible Society, for the express purpose of enabling it to supply the slaves with the Bible, which are to be called 'the slaves' fund.'

That we recommend to all our churches to aid this noble enterprise, by special donations to this object, and urge the American Bible Society to prosecute such supply with speed and vigor.

These resolutions were advocated by Rev. G. W. Perkins, in a speech of much animation and force. We were sending the Bible by millions to the heathen abroad. Why not send it to the heathen at home? They deeply need it. In many cases, masters desire them to have it. Human laws that forbid it, are we bound to regard as null and void.

Rev. T. D. P. Stone agreed to most of the views of Mr. P. The Bible should be given to every slave; for every one has rights, a conscience, an immortal soul. Politicians, even, were ready for it. The warmest advocates of slavery insist that the Bible supports their system. Let us give them as much of its support as possible.

Dr. Robbins and Mr. Parnes were for speaking in kindness, and thought some of the resolutions wanting in this spirit.

Dr. Hewitt, in reply to the inquiry whether slaveholders do not utterly disregard all laws against teaching slaves, said that so far as he knew, slaveholders themselves said that such laws were not

All men are born free and equal—with certain natural, essential and unalienable rights—among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.
Three millions of the American people are in chains and slavery—held as chattels personal, and bought and sold as marketable commodities.
Seventy thousand infants, the offspring of slave parents, kidnapped as soon as born, and permanently added to the slave population of Christian, (1) Republican, (2) America every year.
Immediate, Unconditional Emancipation.
Slaveholders, Slave-traders and Slave-drivers are to be placed on the same level of infamy, and in the same fiendish category, as kidnappers and men-stealers—a race of monsters unparalleled in their assumption of power, and their despotism cruelty.
The existing Constitution of the United States is a covenant with death, and an agreement with hell.
NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS!

J. BROWN YERRINTON, PRINTER.
WHOLE NO. 862.

made for slave-owners, but for mischief-makers; a trap to be sprung on them, if needed. Multitudes of slaveholders do and will teach their slaves. They conscientiously trample on all laws that forbid it. The greatest difficulty is not with the owners, but with the slaves themselves. He mentioned a case in which, where an owner wished and endeavored to impart instruction to his slaves, they seemed to regard it as only a task imposed, and objected to 'learning to read and working too.'

Mr. Perkins thought all agitation made the state of the slaves better, instead of worse, as the slaveholders would have us believe. It was only about fifteen years ago, that efforts began at the South for the improvement of the slaves, just about the time abolition began its agitation at the North. It was objected that these resolutions were severe, and pointed at slaveholders. But he could remember when Dr. Hewitt used to be far more severe on rummellers, and all thought it right. We have a right to oppose State laws, and are bound to do it, if they oppose God's laws. He saw nothing in the resolutions inconsistent with kindness or truth.

Rev. Mr. Stone said that plans for giving instruction and the gospel to the slaves, were commenced and acted on long before abolition was heard of, and gave facts and dates to prove it.

Rev. Mr. Cleveland was opposed to the resolutions as needless, and especially to the 3rd, as aiming to operate on the slaves, through the Bible Society. If that Society were set to offer the Bible, Christian masters would object, and would not want to memorialize the Society on the subject.

Dr. Tucker was opposed to the third resolution. Mr. Keep said that it was the custom of judges to express an opinion no farther than the case requires. He was opposed to the resolution, because it was merely an inference from the preceding.

Dr. Stone contended that as to the effects of agitation, certain members were mistaken. It was Dr. Charles C. Jones, of Georgia, who had started the improvement just fifteen years ago. From his labors, as the germ, all the subsequent benefits had spread.

Dr. Robbins thought it was not proper to pronounce upon laws enacted by a sovereign State. Mr. Furness thought the resolution inexpedient. He had attended the meeting of the General Assembly at Richmond, and had seen an increasing spirit among the ministers of that body to extend religious instruction among the slaves. Mr. Adger, lately a missionary to Syria, was about to devote himself to preach to the slave population of South Carolina. He found the door open as it was not twelve years ago.

Rev. Mr. Edwards admitted and believed we had a full right to oppose State laws, if they were opposed to those of God. The Bible presents no such view of the sacredness or authority of human government, as to sustain for one moment unholy laws. If the first and second resolutions were passed, he saw no objection to passing the third; for it was the same in principle and spirit. He did not see that such resolutions were specially called for; and objected to calling on the churches for additional contributions, when so many objects were already before them, and to going out of our way to urge the Bible Society to a work to which they would be prompt enough, if it promised good.

Rev. Mr. Hyde thought we over-estimated the effect of passing resolutions on this or any subject. Every good work begins in heaven, and Providence opens the way for it on earth.

Mr. Buman, himself a young man of color, and pastor of a colored church in Hartford, remarked that the original resolutions had passed in the Association unanimously, in simple and plain language they explicated? The Garrisonian Abolitionists denounced the movement of sending Bibles to the slaves. Much had been said of speaking to slaveholders kindly; he thought the voice of kindness and mercy should be spoken also to the slave.

Mr. Dutton spoke of schools having been closed at the South, against the wishes of pious persons; and he wished to have the resolution pass, in order to strengthen the hands of such.

Dr. Davidson, delegate from the Old School General Assembly, would not have spoken a word, were it not for the same reason. He had been borne in mind, that the South and South West had been set led very differently from Connecticut. The state of things was in consequence widely diverse. Religion had never been there the law of the land. The wealth and influence were not in the hands of the church. Laws were passed not in accordance with the conscience of the people, and in point of fact, as had been observed by Dr. Hewitt and others, the law was continually evaded, and instruction given. There was no canon of the General Assembly forbidding the instruction of slaves, or disciplining any person who chose to teach them. As to the effect of agitation, it was the prevailing sentiment among pious persons in the slave States, that the more they were agitated, and only tightened the bonds, and done harm. Of this instances were given. It was this that had closed the schools, and procured the passage of stringent laws. The best plan was to leave this matter in the hands of the church, and it would be forwarded as rapidly and as safely as in any other way.

Further remarks and discussion, the 3rd and 5th resolutions were taken up, and all amended, so as to read as follows, in which form they were passed:

1. Resolved, That every human being has a right to the Holy Scriptures, and a right to acquire the learning necessary to peruse them.

2. That the people of the United States are under special obligations to supply the slaves of our country with the Bible, according to their respective opportunities and abilities.

3. That we are gratified to learn that contributions have been transmitted to the American Bible Society, for the express purpose of enabling it to supply the slaves with the Bible, which are to be called 'the slaves' fund.'

That we recommend to all our churches to aid this noble enterprise, by special donations to this object, and urge the American Bible Society to prosecute such supply with speed and vigor.

These resolutions were advocated by Rev. G. W. Perkins, in a speech of much animation and force. We were sending the Bible by millions to the heathen abroad. Why not send it to the heathen at home? They deeply need it. In many cases, masters desire them to have it. Human laws that forbid it, are we bound to regard as null and void.

Rev. T. D. P. Stone agreed to most of the views of Mr. P. The Bible should be given to every slave; for every one has rights, a conscience, an immortal soul. Politicians, even, were ready for it. The warmest advocates of slavery insist that the Bible supports their system. Let us give them as much of its support as possible.

Dr.

POETRY.

THE BRONZE STATUE.*

Friends and neighbors, cease your traffic; what is
this comes passing near,
Heavy o'er the groaning pavement, moving slowly,
like a bear?

Lo! it seems the sculptured semblance of an old and
reverend man,
Bid them stop awhile before us; let us all the fea-
tures scan.

Well we know him,—yes! we knew him; see his
high and massive brow,
But how solemn looks he sitting; meditating seems
he now.

Yes! those firm and solemn features,—fall the night,
and rise the morn,—
Shall be seen by mortal vision when a thousand years
are gone.

Tell us, thou, how runs his story, while we contem-
plate his end,
Thou whose hoary hair bespeaks thee friend and
comrade of our friend.

Child of this, our Great Republic, brother of the
tolling poor,
Slight assistance gained his labors from the wealthy's
golden store.

But his reasoning tracked the mazes where abstruse
science dwelt;
Early he, an earnest pilgrim, at the feet of Knowl-
edge knelt.

Then we saw him, as a seaman, gain and learning
seek to reap,
Thinking as he ploughed the ocean, studying on the
roaring deep.

Unthought honors heaped on him, foreign lands
proclaimed his worth,
And they named the learned sailor 'mongst the hon-
ored ones of earth.

Many tongues he spoke and studied; gauged the fi-
ery meteor's mass;
And expounded to the people where the blazing com-
ets pass.

Fresher warriors gave his country; not the war-
rior's bloody days,
But the glory which the century to the 'man of uses'
pays.

Failings had he,—he was mortal; friends he num-
bered many a one;
Turn your eyes upon the statue, for my tale is near-
ly done.

Full of years he closed his eyelids, softly drew his
dying breath,
And the flags of many nations waved at half-mast at
his death.

Sits the form like Archimedes, in his closet as he
staid,
Solving earnestly his problem, heedless of the Ro-
man blade.

Messenger to unknown futures, reflex of our age
and clime,
Leader of a stately phalanx, lengthening down the
road of time,

Rising now there comes before me visions of the glo-
rious day,
When the veil that blinds the people, rent in rags,
shall fly away.

Oh, my nation! live and fearless may thy future
glory be,
To count among thy sons of labor, many millions
such as he.

Place the statue on the hillock, where we laid his
bones; alas!
Leave it there until he rises—Back! and let the
statue pass.

Boston, June 16, 1847. MAURICE.

*The bronze statue of Dr. N. Bowditch, Trans-
lator of the *Mecanique Celeste*, etc., modeled by
Ball Hughes, Esq., (and cast by Messrs. Hopp &
Co.), was, on its way to Mount Auburn, placed for
a while, at the hour of high Noon, in State street,
Boston, where the living subject was, when among
us, so well known. For the explanation of the various
allusions in the above lines, we refer the reader to
the appendix to the fourth volume of the *Mecanique
Celeste*, published in 1839.

From the Newcastle (Eng.) Peace Advocate.

Lines addressed to FREDRICK DOUGLASS ON HIS RETURN TO AMERICA.

And thou, indeed, art free!
Thy noble spirit never more shall pine
With the dark thought that night of slavery
Henceforth can e'er be thine!

Homeward thy footsteps turning,
The blue waves wait thee to the land that gave
To thy young heart, for freedom's better burning,
The brand that marks the slave!

Yet it is home to thee,
And there thy loved ones gather round the hearth;
Those whom thy spirit long has yearned to see
Smiling around thy path!

Sweet may that meeting be!
And kind friends greet thee, even green there;
With heart like thine, so warm, and pure, and free,
Friendship is every where!

Yet, should thy pathway lie
'Mid cruel prejudice, unfeeling, scornful,
Oh! lift to heaven a calm and trusting eye,
And have a brighter morn'g.

Yes, for that hour must come
When Freedom's land will to herself be true;
A brighter star shall rise, o'er Slavery's tomb,
And kindle hope anew!

And Truth's pure light be spread
To injured Africa's sable sons and daughters;
Then shall Columbia bid again the bread
She casteth on the waters.

Then shall her sons go forth,
Preaching glad tidings to the world around;
Scattering good seed upon the fruitful earth,
That else were barren found.

But never can she know
The full deep tide of promised blessings given
Unto the merciful, till she shall show
Mercy like that of heaven.

Farewell, a kind farewell;
Heaven shall and avenge thee in trial's hour,
And nerve thy free heart, boldly still to tell
Of Slavery's cruel power.

L. S.

'THE ROOT OF ALL EVIL.'

BY THOMAS HOOD.

Gold! gold! gold! gold!
Bright and yellow, hard and cold,
Molten, given, hammer'd and rolled;
Heavy to get, and light to hold;
Hoarded, barter'd, bought and sold;
Stor'd, borrow'd, squander'd and doled;
Spurn'd by the young, but hugg'd by the old
To the very verge of the church-yard mould;
Price of many a crime untold;
Gold! gold! gold! gold!
Good or bad, a thousand fold.

How widely its agencies vary.
To save, to ruin, to curse, to bless;
As even its mistle-cobweb express—
Now stamp'd with image of good Queen Bess,
And now of bloody Mary.

REFORMATORY.

NON-RESISTANCE QUARTERLY MEETING.

The Quarterly Meeting of the Non-Resistant Society, notified in our last No., was held at Wrentham on Wednesday and Thursday, the 16th and 17th inst., and was an exceedingly interesting one throughout. An omnibus load of about twenty persons went to Wrentham, and on arriving at Wrentham Chapel, where the meeting was to be held the first day, our hearts rather shook within us as we saw so very few assembled. We feared that we had come there in vain. But the people of the neighborhood soon began to collect together, and before noon the house was well filled with attentive and interested auditors. The meeting was called to order by the President of the Society, Mr. Adin Ballou, when Wm. H. Fish was chosen Secy. Secretary, who reports the following proceedings:

On the first day of the meeting, there was no specific resolutions brought forward for discussion, but questions were asked and answered, addressed, made, according to the promptings of each individual mind, and the demands of the occasion. J. S. White, minister of the Chapel in which we met, offered a fervent prayer for the divine blessing on our enterprise, after which he most cordially welcomed all to the accommodation and hospitality of himself and friends, and expressed an earnest desire that every speaker should be entirely free in the utterance of his opinions. It was known, he said, that himself and brethren were looking for the second advent of the Saviour, and some might be disposed, by their sense of courtesy, to avoid saying anything that would conflict with their faith; but he wished them not to do so. He should not be offended at the utterance of any honest conviction, however much it might differ from his own. And it was sometimes exceedingly difficult for speakers to abstain from incidentally bringing into their remarks, the peculiarities of their religious faith. He himself was not at all disturbed by a circumlocution which, partially destroyed the effect of what he wished to say. Let us, then, said he, place no such restraints upon each other's thoughts. And this manly and liberal expression of his views and feelings was heartily responded to by all present, and they were doubtless of much advantage to the meeting. How very few professed ministers of the gospel have the nobleness to stand in such a position!

Wm. Coe of Medford remarked, that he supposed nearly all present were strongly impressed in favor of Non-Resistance. Our business was not, therefore, so much with each other, as to act upon public sentiment. The times indicated this. The Mexican war was doing a dreadful work among our fellow-men. The town in which he lived was being very cruelly agitated by it. At that time, he said, by the return of a young officer, who had been wounded in the war. The people, there, who had hitherto opposed this war, seemed now indefinitely favorable to it, because one of their neighbors and friends had come home with a Mexican ball in his person. They appeared to think the circumstance called for vengeance. A few soldiers, he heard, had been shot and killed in a sermon against the Mexican war, and one in favor of Non-Resistance. When this minister left the meeting-house, a lady asked him what impression he supposed his sermon had upon her mind. She said, she felt about this particular war. So did her son. But he felt himself bound to engage in it, for the government required this service from him. Now, said Mr. Coe, the people need light on this subject. Men are doing, in their governmental capacity, what they freely confess would be sinful in them, in their individual capacities.

A certain man, he continued, said to me a few days ago—the question is, whether we shall sustain the government as they are, or whether we shall leave it alone. But this is not the question. The real question is, whether we shall obey God, or act from the dictation of men. We do not go against government *per se*, but only against the principle of violence now embodied in it.

Mr. Henshaw of Attleboro, wanted to know how long it would take to form a government on true principle. He thought like to be informed if a bad government was not better than no government, and if it were not better to sustain a bad one till the people should be ready to form one in accordance with the spirit of Christianity?

Mr. Coe replied, that he could not tell how long it would be before we could have a Christian government, until he should know how long it would be before we could have a Christian people. Webers, and the people generally, would become Christians. But he could not support any existing government, because he could not innocently swear away all the principles of the gospel. What command in the decalogue, he would ask, was not our army in Mexico trampling under foot? The very cry of rebellion, he said, was a short time ago throughout the country, was a cry for the South; whilst here at home, some of the ministers who approved of war, will not ride ten miles on an exchange upon that holy day!

Mr. Henshaw said he was not satisfied with this answer.

C. O. Read, of Hopedale, wished to say a few words to him. He said, friend Henshaw says we must have a government. So say we. What government? Three things are essential. There must be first, a ruler or rulers; second, laws; third, people. Now I have a government, Jesus Christ is my ruler. This is the true government. It will prevail to the destruction of all others. The people are now sustaining governments, and their many gross evils, by voting men into various offices. We may succeed in electing a good man, but we will not consent to form a Christian government, but to follow Christ ourselves.

Mr. Blanchard, of Dorchester, thought if the people were all Non-Resistant, there would be no army among them; but if they wouldn't come under the government of the Christian spirit and principles, they must necessarily consent to have a bad government. He thought that God had ordained that wicked men should take care of one another, so far as governing was concerned. This point he illustrated very clearly, and in a very kind spirit, by a supposition which he said he was in the habit of making among his neighbors.

Adin Ballou said that out of the idea that some governments are necessary, in which the majority shall rule, comes the motto—Our country, right or wrong! Men felt themselves bound to do in their governmental capacities, what they freely confessed would be sinful in them as individuals. But Christians should sustain only Christian governments, and be guided in all the relations of life by definite and fixed principles. Now the glory of Non-Resistance is, God says, thou shalt not withhold thy hand from violence, and not in the case of friends merely, but in the case of enemies. It says to every one—you must not kill, must not mutilate, must not injure your fellow-being. But, says one—if my neighbor injure me, may I not injure him? No. May I not hang the murderer? No. May I not take necessary measures in carrying on war, and in the execution of its penal vengeance? No. You must totally abstain from violence under all circumstances, and in all the relations of life. And this principle might be reduced to practice. Men might generally carry it out without suffering martyrdom—without even sacrificing as much as our soldiers do in going into the Mexican war.

But, as most of the time improve. By Mr. Ballou was occupied in answering questions put to him by various individuals, and in familiar illustrations of Non-Resistance, we shall not attempt a further report of his remarks. He made this opening meeting a very interesting one, by a remarkably clear, felicitous and impressive exposition and defence of the doctrine, after which Abner Belcher, and another brother belonging to Wrentham, made some appropriate and interesting remarks, which were followed by a song, when the meeting adjourned for one hour.

Wednesday—Afternoon Session.

The meeting being called to order, the services were commenced by a Song of Peace, prepared for the occasion.

Mr. Blanchard said, if the people would look at the New Testament alone for a proof of Non-Resistance, they would undoubtedly find it there. But they usually go beyond that Book—they go to the organized church as an authorized Commentary upon it. He understood that every warship carried Bibles on board, and in which millions of our fellow beings are being sacrificed every year. And how many other great men, and men who had obtained some insight into Christian principles, have fallen before it in a similar manner! Look at some of the leaders in the anti-slavery punishment movement, and at Cassius M. Clay—all left their limbs.

Adin Ballou thought it necessary to consider, first principles. It was astonishing, he said, to look upon the war, and see many professing to be friends of Peace, and yet go for War. Truly all say they are Peace men, but apply the test to them, and they give evidence that they still belong to the kingdom of Violence. Peace isn't a principle with them. We have Peace Societies, yet they are very much opposed to the term Non-Resistance. But he thought that the right name for this was just the term to bring people out. We can't always tell where to find those who profess to be Peace men. We can't tell where ministers stand from their Discourses on Peace—whether they speak as Whigs or as Christians. Some of them undoubtedly speak much more strongly against the Mexican War than they would if it had been conceived and were approved by the Whigs. But the term Non-Resistance is fixed, certain, definite. If a man professes to be a Non-Resistant, you know where to find him; you certainly do, if he be true to his profession. It is not so with those who go for killing under certain circumstances. If you hear them one day declaiming against capital punishment, and on the next you hear of their going to fight in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the use of force to defend himself, or to fight in self-defence, or in self-righteousness, or in the Mexican War. Men who stand upon the principle that war is sometimes justifiable, will find reason enough to justify almost any war. If it is true that man may innocently maul, bruise, mutilate and destroy his brother man, then every one will be his own judge as to when he may do this work. And if he is right in this, he will be right in the